

**MORE ABOUT ORBITALLY EXCITED
HADRONS FROM LATTICE QCD**

Thomas A. DeGrand

Matthew W. Hecht

Department of Physics

University of Colorado

Boulder, Colorado 80309

ABSTRACT: This is a second paper describing the calculation of spectroscopy for orbitally excited states from lattice simulations of Quantum Chromodynamics. New features include higher statistics for P-wave systems and first results for the spectroscopy of D-wave mesons and baryons, for relatively heavy quark masses. We parameterize the Coulomb gauge wave functions for P-wave and D-wave systems and compare them to those of their corresponding S-wave states.

I. INTRODUCTION

Recently we presented some preliminary results from an exploratory calculation of the masses of P-wave mesons and baryons from lattice Monte Carlo simulations of Quantum Chromodynamics in quenched approximation with Wilson fermions.¹ This communication describes the final results from these simulations. We have increased the statistics of our P-wave study. There is a hint of some fine structure splitting in the charmonium system. We also present first results for D-wave spectroscopy of fairly heavy quark mesons and baryons. Finally, we show some of the properties of Coulomb gauge meson and baryon wave functions of P-wave and D-wave systems, and compare them to S-wave wave functions at the same quark masses.²

Only recently has lattice QCD spectroscopy begun to move beyond ground state hadrons. Some P-wave states' masses are regularly measured in staggered simulations because they are the odd parity partners of "ordinary" states: the a_1 and ρ are examples of such pairs. In nonrelativistic QCD, Lepage and Thacker³ have computed the masses of χ_C and χ_B states (without including spin effects). Few Wilson simulations have studied P-wave states. The APE collaboration⁴ measured masses of some P-wave mesons in quenched simulations at $6/g^2 = \beta = 5.7$, but has had difficulty in continuing their program to higher β .⁵ Recently, El-Khadra, Hockney, Kronfeld, and Mackenzie have presented a calculation of the 1P-1S splitting in charmonium, which they use to fix the strong coupling constant.⁶ This calculation was done with a smaller lattice spacing than the one we report here, and with an improved action for the fermions.

Calculations of the masses of orbital excitations in lattice simulations are difficult for three reasons: First, one needs to measure a correlation function with nonzero overlap onto the desired L sector and zero overlap on $L = 0$, otherwise the signal will be dominated at large t by the lighter $L = 0$ states. Our methodology solves this problem. Second, the

signal is intrinsically noisy.⁷ A diagonal correlator, $C(t) = \langle 0 | \Gamma(t) \Gamma(0) | 0 \rangle$, which falls off at large t like $\exp(-E_1 t)$ where E_1 is the energy of the lightest state which the operator Γ can create from the vacuum, has fluctuations given by

$$\sigma_\Gamma^2 = \frac{1}{N} (\langle |\Gamma(t) \Gamma(0)|^2 \rangle - C(t)^2). \quad (1.1)$$

Due to its first term, σ_Γ^2 decays with a mass characteristic of the lightest particle $|\Gamma|^2$ can make from the vacuum. If Γ is a meson operator (creating a $\bar{q}q$ pair) Γ^2 will create a $q^2 \bar{q}^2$ state, which will most likely couple to a $\pi\pi$ pair. Its correlator will fall like $\exp(-2m_\pi t)$. In the baryon sector $|\Gamma|^2$ will make a $q^3 \bar{q}^3$ state, and the lightest such state is three pions. Thus we expect a signal to noise ratio to be a falling function of t : $\sigma/C_H(t) \simeq \exp(m_H - m_\pi)t$ for mesons, and $\sigma/C_H(t) \simeq \exp(m_H - 3/2 m_\pi)t$ for baryons. This is a more serious problem for orbitally excited states than for S-wave states because their energy differences are larger. Finally, the baryon sector includes multiple states with the same quantum numbers, which will appear in the same correlators. For example, in the $L = 1$ [70] of $SU(6)$,⁸ the nonstrange sector includes one $j = 5/2$ and two $j = 3/2$ and $j = 1/2$ nucleons, and $j = 3/2$ and $j = 1/2$ Δ 's.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Construction of Orbitally Excited States

We construct orbitally excited states by using interpolating fields which couple only to a specific angular momentum eigenstate, which are projected onto zero momentum and which are of large spatial extent to maximize overlap with the state. Our strategy is look at correlators of different operators at $t = 0$ and $t \neq 0$.

At the $t \neq 0$ end of the correlation function we use an operator which depends on the relative separation of the quarks, which is conventionally referred to as a “wave function.”⁹ The wave function $\psi_G(r)$ of a hadron H in a gauge G is defined as

$$\psi_G(r) = \sum_{\vec{x}} \langle H | q(\vec{x}) \bar{q}(\vec{x} + \vec{r}) | 0 \rangle \quad (2.1)$$

where $q(\vec{x})$ and $\bar{q}(\vec{y})$ are quantum mechanical operators which create a quark and an antiquark at locations $\vec{x}$ and $\vec{y}$. (We have suppressed Dirac and color indices.) Our correlation function is constructed from convolutions of quark and antiquark propagators $G(x, y)$

$$C(\vec{r}, t) = \sum_{\vec{x}} \langle 0 | \Psi(\vec{y}_1, \vec{y}_2) G_q(\vec{y}_1, 0; \vec{x}, t) G_{\bar{q}}(\vec{y}_2, 0; \vec{x} + \vec{r}, t) | 0 \rangle \quad (2.2)$$

where $\Psi(\vec{y}_1, \vec{y}_2)$ is the $t = 0$ operator. At large t if the mass of the hadron is m_H , then

$$C(\vec{r}, t) \simeq \exp(-m_H t) \psi_G(\vec{r}) \quad (2.3)$$

and so by plotting $C(\vec{r}, t)$ as a function of $\vec{r}$ we can reconstruct the wave function up to an overall constant. We measure the mass of a state by convoluting $C(\vec{r}, t)$ with some test function which further projects out the desired state:

$$C(t) = \sum_{\vec{r}} \psi_{test}^*(\vec{r}) C(\vec{r}, t). \quad (2.4)$$

At $t = 0$ we take an operator which is separable in the coordinates of the quarks. For a meson we use

$$\Psi(x_1, x_2) = \phi_1(x_1)\phi_2(x_2). \quad (2.5)$$

In order to couple to orbital excitations we take ϕ_1 to be an S-wave and ϕ_2 to be some orbitally excited state with angular momentum l , centered around some specified coordinate. This state is a linear superposition of a $\vec{p} = 0$ $L = l$ orbital excitation and a state whose center of mass momentum is nonzero (this is the familiar “translation mode” of a shell model state). Convoluting quark propagators as in Eqn. (2.2) removes the $\vec{p} \neq 0$ state and gives us the wave function of the $\vec{p} = 0$ $L = l$ state.

B. Spin Considerations

We did not construct a complete set of P-wave or D-wave mesons and baryons. Instead, we proceeded as follows (for P-waves): We worked in a basis in which γ_0 is diagonal. Our sources and sinks were chosen to couple only to the upper (large) components of the Dirac spinor. We constructed propagators for S-wave quarks with $m_s = \pm 1/2$ and for P-wave quarks with $m_l = 1$, $m_s = \pm 1/2$. We can then completely construct the $|jm\rangle = |22\rangle$ 3P_2 and $|jm\rangle = |11\rangle$ 1P_1 mesons, as well as the $|jm\rangle = |\frac{5}{2}\frac{5}{2}\rangle$ nucleon $N(5/2)$. We formed two other meson states with $S = 1$ and $m_j = 1$ and 0 ($m_S = 0$ and -1) which are not angular momentum eigenstates; while we will label them as 3P_1 and 3P_0 they couple to all three 3P states. (The “ 3P_1 ” state is $(\uparrow\downarrow + \downarrow\uparrow)|11\rangle$; the “ 3P_0 ” state is $(\downarrow\downarrow)|11\rangle$.) If the ordering of states on the lattice were as in charmonium, the lightest state in the channel would have the smallest j for a given m_j and the wavefunctions would in fact project out the states which they label. In the baryon sector we constructed uud bound states with $m_j = 3/2$ ($\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow|11\rangle$) and $-1/2$ ($\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow|11\rangle$).

D-wave spectroscopy is identical apart from the substitution of $l = 2$ for $l = 1$: we

completely construct the 3D_3 and 1D_2 meson states, and construct $m_j = 2$ and 1 states which overlap 3D_2 and 3D_1 states. We construct nucleons of $m_j = 7/2, 3/2$ and $1/2$.

This is an incomplete construction forced on us by computer memory limitations and a desire to keep the calculation simple. A dedicated simulation should do this properly, but will need many more quark propagators. Note also that while we are using nonrelativistic wave functions, they have the quantum numbers appropriate to the desired states and will couple to them, and not to S-wave states, regardless of whether the quarks are actually relativistic.

C. Details of the Simulations

We performed the simulations using the Connection Machine CM-2 at the Pittsburgh Supercomputing Center. Our data set consists of eighty lattices for P-wave studies, of which the last fifty were also analyzed for D-wave systems, computed in quenched approximation at coupling $\beta = 6$, separated by a combination of microcanonical overrelaxed¹⁰ and Kennedy-Pendleton quasi-heat bath¹¹ sweeps (100 passes of a pattern of four overrelaxed sweeps through the lattice and one heat bath sweep). The lattice size is 16^4 sites. We gauge fixed each of the lattice configurations to Coulomb gauge using an overrelaxation algorithm.¹² We used Wilson fermions. We used a fast matrix inverter provided by C. Liu of Thinking Machines, Inc.¹³ to construct quark propagators. We computed P-wave spectroscopy at three hopping parameters corresponding to relatively heavy quark masses: $\kappa = 0.130, 0.1450$, and 0.1520 , and D-wave spectroscopy at $\kappa = 0.1300$ and 0.1450 . The pseudoscalar mass in lattice units at these three κ 's is 1.43, 0.83, and 0.56. We used heavy quarks because the size of the wave function for the orbitally excited states are much larger than the size of an S-wave bound state and if the quark mass becomes too small, the wave function is squeezed by the simulation volume.

In Eqn. (2.4) we use a test function $\psi_{test} = \exp(-(r/r_0)^2)r^l Y_l^l(\Omega)$, in the relative coordinate. We take ϕ_1 in Eqn. (2.5) to be a Gaussian centered at the origin and ϕ_2 to be $\exp(-(r/r_0)^2)r^l Y_l^l(\Omega)$. (As a technical note, when the width of the Gaussian becomes large compared to the size of the lattice one must worry about edge effects. We do that by replacing the spherical harmonic by a function which has the same symmetry but is periodic in the box (of size L): $Y_1^1 = (x+iy)/r \rightarrow (\sin 2\pi x/L + i \sin 2\pi y/L)/r$.) The width of the Gaussians used in Ψ and ψ_{test} was taken to be 2, 2, and $2\sqrt{2}$ lattice spacings for the three κ 's.

We recorded wavefunctions for 3P_2 , 1P_1 , 3D_3 and 1D_2 mesons and for $N(5/2)$ and $N(7/2)$ baryons, at time slices 4, 5, and 6. All baryon wave functions pin the two quarks in a relative S-state to the same coordinate. We folded meson data onto one octant of the spatial lattice and baryon data onto one quadrant before storing it, and in addition kept data on one plane without folding.

III. WAVE FUNCTIONS

A. Pictures of Wave Functions

Now we display some of the features of P-wave and D-wave wave functions and compare some of their simple observables to those of S-wave mesons of our earlier study.² We begin our display of results for wave functions by showing some pictures of Coulomb gauge meson and baryon wave functions.

In Figs. 1 and 2 we display plots of the real part of the wave function in the plane $z = 0$ for a $\kappa = .152$ $N(5/2)$ baryon and a $\kappa = .145$ 3D_3 meson, respectively. The contours show the locations where ψ is a multiple of twenty per cent of its maximum value. The data for these graphs have not been spatially averaged. They show the characteristic dipole and quadrupole structure of the appropriate spherical harmonic. The fact that these distributions are not symmetric gives the reader an impression of the fluctuations in the data. They also give some idea of the extent to which the granularity of the lattice distorts the state, and the extent to which the state fits into the simulation volume.

In order to further illustrate the extent to which a state fits in the simulation volume, we display in Fig. 3 a set of three dimensional contours of constant absolute value of the real part of the wave function. This figure, for the $\kappa = .145$ 3D_3 meson, shows the characteristic four lobe quadrupole structure whose outer regions are compromised by the simulation volume. This is a problem for all the lighter mass states; all the $\kappa = .130$ mesons appear to fit reasonably well into the simulation volume.

Finally, we extract the radial wave function $f(r)$ itself, from

$$f(r) = Re \psi(\vec{r}) / Re Y_l^l(\Omega). \quad (3.1)$$

The Coulomb gauge radial wave functions for $\kappa = .145$ 3P_2 and 3D_3 mesons are shown in Figs. 4 and 5. They appear to show the characteristic linear and quadratic zeros of the wave function at the origin.

B. Fitting Wave Function Parameters

The goal of this section is to provide simple analytical parameterizations of wave functions which can be used for future studies of spectroscopy and to provide checks for calculations of wave function properties performed directly on the data.

Fitting the wave functions proved to be unexpectedly difficult because of the high correlations among wave functions at different separations. With only fifty or eighty lattices we had to fit a subset of the data since correlated fits require more lattices than fitted points. We elected to choose coordinates along axes where the spherical harmonic was unity (up to a sign); this gives us seven ($z = 1$ to 7) points to fit. We folded all directions related by reflections onto this axis with the necessary signs. Then we fit the radial wave function $f(r)$ including a periodic or antiperiodic image term from the boundary (we fit $f_{test}(r) = g(r) \pm g(L - r)$).

After a certain amount of trial and error we chose to fit to

$$g(r) = A(r + br^2) \exp(-cr) \quad (3.2)$$

for P-waves and

$$g(r) = A(r^2 + br^4) \exp(-cr) \quad (3.3)$$

for D-waves, plus image terms, and we believe that many other simple functional forms would work as well. The data cannot distinguish between these or more complicated functions, and if we try to force a fit, the Hessian matrix becomes singular. We fit the

baryon data to the same parameters (recall that we have pinned two quarks together, so there is only one relative coordinate left).

The data are very correlated and the matrix of correlations very singular. It was not unusual to find correlation matrices whose conditioning number (ratio of largest to smallest eigenvalue) approached several thousand. The conditioning number was not stable: fitting half the lattices in a data set could cause the conditioning number to vary by a factor of two. We could also achieve a considerable variation in the conditioning number by varying elements in the correlation matrix by hand by a per cent or so. In contrast, the correlation matrices for propagators had conditioning numbers on the order of 50 and were quite stable under the same tests. Typically, in a 7 by 7 correlation matrix, only the largest 3 or 4 eigenvalues remained reasonably stable as the number of lattices in the data set was varied. Therefore we adopted the following strategy for determining the parameters in $f(r)$: we looked at uncorrelated fits, correlated fits to all parameters (very unstable), correlated fits in which the correlation matrix had its smallest three eigenvalues removed (via singular value decomposition) and correlated fits to a subset of the data (often $r = 1,3,5,7$). In the latter case one could not use consecutive points since either one or both of the correlation matrix or the Hessian matrix would become singular. The D-wave data was much more difficult to deal with than the P-wave data in this respect.

The overall normalization of the wave function is not important for spectroscopy studies. The parameters b and c for P-wave mesons are displayed in Fig. 6 and for D-wave mesons in Fig. 7.

C. Moments of Wave Functions

The n th moment of the meson wave function is defined in terms of $\psi(\vec{r})$ as

$$\langle r^n \rangle = \frac{\int r^2 dr \left(\frac{r}{2}\right)^n f(r)^2}{\int r^2 dr f(r)^2}. \quad (3.4)$$

The factor of $1/2$ is included so that the second moment defined this way (when appropriately weighted by quark charges) reduces to the second moment of the quark charge distribution defined through the form factor.

We determined the first and second moments of our meson wave functions in two ways: first, we computed it directly from the data, by performing a single elimination jackknife analysis, and second, we computed it using the fitted form of wave functions. We consider the second method to be more reliable since in many cases the wave function is still large at the edge of the simulation volume. Only a fit which includes image effects can correctly reproduce the tail of the wave function.

In all cases and for both jackknife and using the fitted radial wave function the values of two moments were independent of timeslice, although the uncertainty increases with increasing t . We display the first and second moments at $t = 4$ in Figs. 8 and 9 respectively. We see that while the two methods give rather similar results for the $\kappa = .1300$ mesons, at smaller quark mass the discrepancy becomes pronounced.

The P-wave wave functions are larger than the S-wave wave functions, and the D-wave ones are larger still. Notice that the diameter of the wave function in the simulation is four times $\langle r \rangle$ of Eqn. (3.4), so that the simulation volume we use would appear to be too small for D-wave systems made of lighter quarks.

IV. SPECTROSCOPY

We extracted masses from our data by fitting the correlation function $C(t)$ of Eqn. (5) in the standard way, and looked at “effective masses” (local slope of $C(t)$) and fits to a range t_{min} to $t_{max} = n_t/2 = 8$. All data are fit including the effects of correlations at different times.¹⁴

As a general rule for selecting the best fit value to present in a figure or table, we use “fit histograms.” A fit is represented by a rectangle centered on the best fit value for a mass μ , with a width given by (twice) the uncertainty of the fit (i.e. $\mu \pm \Delta\mu$), and a height which is the confidence level of the fit (to emphasize good fits) times the number of degrees of freedom (to emphasize fits over big distance ranges) divided by the statistical error on the parameter (to emphasize fits with small errors). The fit with the greatest height is the one we quote. This was the method used to select the best mass in an earlier S-wave spectroscopy calculation.¹⁵

A. P-wave Spectroscopy

Fig. 10 shows effective masses and fits to a range of t values for the meson and baryon data.

All baryon masses at all κ values appear to be consistent; there is little sign of a drift of the masses with choice of fitting range. There is no evidence of any fine structure splitting in any of the κ values. One cannot say whether this is due to a small intrinsic splitting on the lattice, or whether all operators are merely coupling strongly to the $j = 5/2$ nucleon. In our extrapolations we will make the latter assumption.

The $\kappa = .1300$ mesons also have stable, consistent fits. The best fit values from histograms all begin at $t = 2$. There is a hint of the appearance of fine structure splitting

in the multiplet, as shown in Fig. 11. The splitting qualitatively resembles charmonium fine structure splitting, with the 3P_0 state the lightest and the other states more nearly degenerate. However, uncertainties are so large that this probably should not be taken too seriously. These data seem to be limited by statistics.

The $\kappa = .1450$ data is noisier by about a factor of two. The 3P_2 state is heavier than the 1P_1 . The 3P_0 signal never stabilizes; while the fit from $t_{min} = 2$ is satisfactory from the point of view of chi-squared (7.0 for 5 degrees of freedom) fits at increasing t_{min} 's produce monotonically falling masses. Fit histograms are shown in Fig. 12. The 3P_1 state is degenerate with the 3P_2 , but with large errors.

Finally, the $\kappa = .1520$ data share the same features as the $\kappa = .1450$ data, with slightly larger uncertainties. The P-wave lattice masses are listed in Table I.

B. D-wave spectroscopy

The D-wave data is noisier than the P-wave data (as expected). Typical uncertainties for masses are about 0.08, four times the P-wave value. All masses appear to be asymptotic by $t_{min} = 2 - 3$ and all signals disappeared into the noise by $t = 6$. Because the data is so noisy, we could see no evidence for fine structure splitting in a multiplet. Fig. 13 shows effective masses and fits to a range of t values for the meson and baryon data. The masses are listed in Table II.

C. Comparison to Experiment

It is difficult to convert these lattice numbers into reliable quantities which can be compared to experiment. At $\beta = 6.0$ one is far from the scaling region. S-wave spectroscopy with Wilson fermions does not agree with experiment. The quark hopping parameters

we have used are very distant from the zero quark mass value. We will glance at two comparisons, but we have to say that with the quality of the signals they should probably not be taken very seriously as other than qualitative observations.

The masses are shown in Fig. 14. First, if we extrapolate all masses linearly in κ to $\kappa_c = 0.1567$, we find $am(^3P_2) = .93(3)$, $am(^1P_1) = .73(4)$, $am(N(5/2)) = 1.07(4)$, and the D-wave meson and baryon are at 1.18(10) and 1.93(20) respectively. The proton mass at κ_c from our S-wave wave function study² is $am(N) = 0.55(1)$, so we have $m(^3P_2)/m(N) = 1.70(6)$, $m(^1P_1)/m(N) = 1.33(8)$, $m(N(5/2))/m(N) = 1.94(8)$, and the ratios of the D-wave meson and baryon to the nucleon mass are 2.14(18) and 3.5(4).

Experimental data corresponding to these states are $m(a_2)/m(N) = 1.40$ or $m(f_2)/m(N) = 1.35$, $m(b_1)/m(N) = 1.31$, $m(N(1675))/m(N) = 1.78$, $m(\rho_3(1690))/m(N) = 1.80$, and $m(N(2220))/m(N) = 2.36$. The P-wave masses look qualitatively correct, but the D-wave states (from which the extrapolation in κ is enormous) are too high.

As another comparison to experiment we can try to predict the mass of the D-wave states in charmonium. To do this, we must extrapolate in κ from our $\kappa = .1300$ data point to the charm mass. We also need a value for the lattice spacing a , which could vary by thirty per cent at this β value depending on how it is chosen. We determine κ and a by taking lattice determinations of the 3P_2 and 3S_1 states at $\kappa = 0.130, 0.145$, and 0.152 and extrapolating their masses linearly in κ . (We use the data of Ref. 16 for the $\kappa = .1300$ vector meson). We determine the lattice spacing by fitting the extrapolated masses to the $\psi(3095)$ and $\chi(3555)$ masses. This gives a charm hopping parameter of $\kappa = .1224$ and an inverse lattice spacing of $1/a = 1790$ MeV. (Note that determining the lattice spacing from our proton mass data would give $1/a = 1710$ MeV; from the rho meson, $1/a = 2264$ MeV.) The extrapolated common D-meson mass is then 3.99(16) MeV, where the error is only from the extrapolation. The 3D_1 $c\bar{c}$ state is at 3.77 GeV but its mass is influenced by the nearby $D\bar{D}$ threshold. Model calculations¹⁷ of D-wave states (some of which are narrow

since their decays to $D\bar{D}$ are forbidden) give masses of 3.81 to 3.84 GeV. At this value of the lattice spacing our ${}^3P_2 - {}^3P_0$ mass splitting at $\kappa = .1300$ is 63 MeV; in charmonium the corresponding number is 145 MeV.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In retrospect, many aspects of the project could have been done better. We should have completely reconstructed the spin structure of all the different states. We should have recorded wave functions for all timeslices and not just for big t 's. Then we could have used the wave functions we determined in Sec. III as the input for $\psi_{test}(r)$ for spectroscopy calculations.

It is clear that this program could be carried to arbitrarily high angular momentum states. To do so will probably require very high statistics, a more fine-grained lattice (since the lobe structure of the angular part of the wave function becomes more pronounced) and a larger simulation volume, since the size of the wave function grows with angular momentum.

Note that the uncertainties on the P-wave masses fell by about a factor of two when the data set increased from 20 to 80 lattices. This suggests that the calculations of P-wave meson masses are almost certainly limited only by statistics. Meson P-wave spectroscopy still needs to improve its uncertainties by another factor of two to four before it can begin to make a serious comparison with experimental data, but we believe that this would be an easy thing for any large scale spectroscopy simulation to do. A reliable method for identifying specific baryon states remains to be demonstrated.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank C. Liu for providing us with a copy of his matrix inverter. The computations described in this work were carried out at the Pittsburgh Supercomputing Center. The work was supported by the U. S. Department of Energy.

Table I. P-wave meson and baryon masses in lattice units.

κ	state	mass
0.1300	3P_2	1.747(23)
0.1300	3P_1	1.759(22)
0.1300	3P_0	1.712(19)
0.1300	1P_1	1.760(21)
0.1450	3P_2	1.313(25)
0.1450	3P_1	1.322(74)
0.1450	3P_0	1.278(35)
0.1450	1P_1	1.210(37)
0.1520	3P_2	1.05(3)
0.1520	3P_1	0.96(3)
0.1520	3P_0	1.03(7)
0.1520	1P_1	0.88(4)
0.1300	baryon	2.56(2)
0.1450	baryon	1.79(4)
0.1520	baryon	1.28(4)

Table II. D-wave meson and baryon masses in lattice units.

κ	state	mass
0.1300	meson	2.00(6)
0.1450	meson	1.54(5)
0.1300	baryon	3.0(1)
0.1450	baryon	2.4(1)

FIGURE CAPTIONS

1. Wave function of the $\kappa = 0.152$ $N(5/2)$ baryon in the plane $z = 0$. The contours show interpolated lines of constant real ψ in multiples of 0.2 times the maximum value of ψ . The shading shows the value of the wave function (black is most negative, white most positive), interpolating from the original 16^2 lattice to a 64^2 grid.
2. Wave function of the $\kappa = .145$ 3D_3 meson in the plane $z = 0$. The contours and shading are parameterized as in Fig. 1.
3. Surfaces of constant absolute amplitude of the $\kappa = .145$ 3D_3 meson in three dimensions, in fractions of its maximum: (a) $|\psi| = 0.2\psi_{max}$, (b) $|\psi| = 0.4\psi_{max}$, (c) $|\psi| = 0.5\psi_{max}$, (d) $|\psi| = 0.6\psi_{max}$. The “breaks” in the surfaces in (a) and (b) occur when the surfaces intersect the edge of the simulation volume.
4. Radial wave function of the $\kappa = .145$ 3P_2 meson. Crosses show all points; squares are points along the x axis used to fit the wave function (fit is the line).
5. Radial wave function of the $\kappa = .145$ 3D_3 meson. Crosses show all points; squares are points used to fit the wave function (fit is the line).
6. Fit parameters of P-wave wave functions (a) b parameter (b) c parameter. Points are labeled with crosses for 3P_2 mesons, squares for 1P_1 mesons, diamonds for $N(5/2)$ baryons.
7. Fit parameters of D-wave wave functions (a) b parameter (b) c parameter. Points are labeled with crosses for 3D_3 mesons, squares for 1D_2 mesons, diamonds for $N(7/2)$ baryons.
8. First moment of P-wave and D-wave meson wave functions (a) from a jackknife analysis and (b) from the fitted radial wave functions. Points are labeled with crosses for 3P_2 , squares for 1P_1 , diamonds for 3D_3 , octagons for 1D_2 mesons, and fancy squares for

the pseudoscalar (data from Ref. 2).

9. Second moment of P-wave and D-wave meson wave functions (a) from a jackknife analysis and (b) from the fitted radial wave functions. Points are labeled as in Fig. 8.
10. Spectroscopy of P-wave mesons and baryons. (a) meson effective masses, (b) meson fits to a range, (c) baryon effective masses and (d) baryon fits to a range. The three bands (in order of increasing mass) correspond to $\kappa = 0.152$, 0.145 , and 0.130 . In each meson group, the 1P_1 state is labelled by a cross, the 3P_0 state by an octagon, the 3P_1 state by a square, and 3P_2 state by a diamond. For baryons, the cross labels the $P_{1/2}$ state, the octagon the $P_{3/2}$ state, and the square the $P_{5/2}$ state.
11. Fine structure splitting in the P-wave meson multiplets (a) $\kappa = 0.130$, (b) $\kappa = 0.145$, (c) $\kappa = 0.152$.
12. “Fit histograms” of $\kappa = .145$ P-wave mesons. (a) 3P_2 mesons, (b) 3P_1 mesons, (c) 3P_0 mesons, (d) 1P_1 mesons.
13. Spectroscopy of D-wave mesons and baryons. (a) meson effective masses, (b) meson fits to a range, (c) baryon effective masses and (d) baryon fits to a range. The two bands (in order of increasing mass) correspond to $\kappa = 0.145$ and 0.130 . In each meson group, the 1D_2 state is labelled by a cross, the 3D_1 state by an octagon, the 3D_2 state by a square, and 3D_3 state by a diamond. For baryons, the cross labels the $D_{1/2}$ state, the octagon the $D_{5/2}$ state, and the square the $D_{7/2}$ state.
14. Masses of P-wave and D-wave hadrons as a function of hopping parameter. Diamonds label 3P_2 mesons, squares 3P_1 , octagons 3P_0 , and crosses, 1P_1 . P-wave baryons are labeled with a fancy cross, D-wave mesons are labeled with a fancy square and D-wave baryons with a burst.

REFERENCES

1. T. DeGrand and M. Hecht, *Phys. Lett.* **B275**, 435 (1992).
2. M. W. Hecht and T. DeGrand, Colorado preprint COLO-HEP-277, 1992.
3. B. Thacker and G. P. Lepage, *Phys. Rev.* **D43**, 196 (1991).
4. P. Bacilieri, et. al., *Phys. Lett.* **214B**, 115 (1988), *Nucl. Phys.* **B317**, 509 (1989).
5. S. Cabasino, et. al., *Phys. Lett.* **258B**, 195 (1991).
6. A. El-Khadra, G. Hockney, A. Kronfeld and P. Mackenzie, Fermilab preprint FERMILAB-PUB-91/354-T, 1991; P. Mackenzie, Fermilab preprint FERMILAB-CONF-92/09-T, 1991; A. El-Khadra, Fermilab preprint FERMILAB-CONF-92/10-T, 1991.
7. See G. P. Lepage, in “From Actions to Answers—Proceedings of the 1989 Theoretical Advanced Summer Institute in Particle Physics,” T. DeGrand and D. Toussaint, eds., (World, 1990).
8. J. Kokkedee, “The Quark Model,” (W. A. Benjamin, New York, 1969).
9. Wave functions computed in a smooth gauge were first introduced by Velikson and Weingarten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B249**, 433 (1985) and by S. Gottlieb, in “Advances in Lattice Gauge Theory,” D. Duke and J. Owens, eds. (World Scientific, 1985). Other recent uses, for heavy-light quark systems are described by E. Eichten, in the Proceedings of Lattice '90, U. Heller, A. Kennedy and S. Sanielevici, eds. *Nucl. Phys.* **B (Proc. Suppl)** **20**, (1991) 475 and C. Bernard, J. Labrenz, and A. Soni, *ibid.*, 488. A gauge-invariant formalism has been described by M.-C. Chu, M. Lassa and J. W. Negele, *Nucl. Phys.* **B360**, 31 (1991).
10. F. Brown and T. Woch, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58**, 2394 (1987); M. Creutz, *Phys.*

- Rev.* **D36**, 55 (1987). For a review, see S. Adler in the Proceedings of the 1988 Symposium on Lattice Field Theory, A. Kronfeld and P. Mackenzie, eds., *Nucl. Phys.* **B (Proc. Suppl)** **9**, (1989) 437.
11. A. Kennedy and B. Pendleton, *Phys. Lett.* **156B**, 393 (1985).
 12. J. E. Mandula and M. C. Ogilvie, *Phys. Lett.* **B248**, 156 (1990).
 13. C. Liu, in the Proceedings of Lattice '90, *Nucl. Phys.* **B (Proc. Suppl)** **20**, (1991) 149.
 14. For a good introduction to error analysis see D. Toussaint, in "From Actions to Answers—Proceedings of the 1989 Theoretical Advanced Summer Institute in Particle Physics," T. DeGrand and D. Toussaint, eds., (World, 1990).
 15. K. Bitar et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 2106 (1990), *Phys. Rev. D* **42**, 3794 (1990).
 16. T. DeGrand and R. Loft, *Phys. Rev.* **D39**, 2678 (1989).
 17. Compare Eichten, et. al., *Phys. Rev.* **D21**, 203 (1980) (3.81 GeV); W. Buchmüller and S-H. Tye, *Phys. Rev.* **D24**, 132 (1981) (3.81 GeV); W. Kwong, J. Rosner, C. Quigg, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **37**, 325 (1987) quote $m(^3D_2) = 3.81$ GeV, $m(^3D_3) = 3.84$ GeV, $m(^1D_2) = 3.82$ GeV from the model of P. Moxhay and J. Rosner, *Phys. Rev.* **D28**, 1132 (1983).





